IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE: . Case No. 22-19361-MBK

(Jointly Administered)

BLOCKFI INC., et al.,

.

Debtors.

May 18, 2023

..... 11:56 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF COMMITTEE'S EMERGENT MOTION BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL B. KAPLAN UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the debtors: Cole Schotz P.C.

By: MICHAEL D. SIROTA, ESQ.

Court Plaza North 25 Main Street

Hackensack, NJ 07601

Kirkland & Ellis LLP

BY: JOSHUA A. SUSSBERG, ESQ.

601 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022

Kirkland & Ellis LLP

BY: MICHAEL B. SLADE, ESQ.

300 North LaSalle Chicago, IL 60654

Audio Operator: Kiya Martin

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. 268 Evergreen Avenue Hamilton, New Jersey 08619 E-mail: jjcourt@jjcourt.com

(609) 586-2311 Fax No. (609) 587-3599

APPEARANCES (Cont'd):

Creditors:

For the Official Brown Rudnick, LLP

Committee of Unsecured By: ROBERT J. STARK, ESQ.

KENNETH AULET, ESQ.

7 Times Square New York, NY 10036

For the U.S. Trustee: Office of the United States Trustee

By: JEFFREY SPONDER, ESQ. LAUREN BIELSKIE, ESQ.

One Newark Center

1085 Raymond Boulevard, Suite 2100

Newark, NJ 07102

2

Case 22-19361-MBK Doc 944 Filed 05/19/23 Entered 05/19/23 14:28:08 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 17

I N D E X

3

<u>EXHIBITS</u> <u>ID</u>. <u>EVD</u>.

Axelrod declaration attachments -- 14

WWW.JJCOURT.COM

1 THE COURT: Good morning again. This is Judge Kaplan 2 and I'm hearing the Committee's emergent motion in the Blockfi Inc. matter. 3 4 I have limited counsel in front of me so let me take 5 appearances. On behalf of the debtor? 6 MR. SIROTA: Good morning, Judge. Michael Sirota, 7 Cole Schotz, along with Joshua Sussberg and Michael Slade from 8 Kirkland. THE COURT: 9 Thank you. 10 On behalf of the Committee? MR. STARK: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Stark 11 12 and Ken Aulet from Brown Rudnick on behalf of the Committee. 13 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. On behalf of the U.S. Trustee? 14 15 MR. SPONDER: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeff Sponder and Lauren Bielskie on behalf of the United States Trustee. 16 17 THE COURT: This Court engaged with all counsel in 18 chambers in a conference outside of the record in an effort to address the issues that were raised in the emergent motion brought before the Court, specifically, the Committee filed an 21 emergent motion requesting an order remedying the debtors' improper plan solicitations in violation of the Bankruptcy Code 22 Section 1125(b). 23 24 The purpose in speaking with counsel off record was

25 to examine the various issues and statements under scrutiny in

and plan with links to certain statements contained in the

24 communications fall outside the scope of permissible activity

25 \parallel under Section 1125(b).

various communications and the issue is whether or not these

7

8

11

12

13

17

20

22

23

24

The Court has reviewed, for instance, the letter to 2 creditors that was e-mailed to Blockfi's customers that was referenced in their tweets. The Court has reviewed the various 4 identified provisions of the disclosure statement to which the 5 Committee has raised concerns given that there were links to 6 such provisions in the various communications to the public, to the customers and to the creditors. And the Court in all candor takes issue with the manner in which these communications were made. Indeed, many of the communications fall outside the scope of permissible solicitation under the Bankruptcy Code.

I applaud the Committee for acting in this emergent fashion to bring the matter before the Court professionally, quickly and efficiently. The manner in which the Committee raised these issues, of course, are consistent with the manner in which they've prosecuted the case on behalf of the Committee, counsel, the manner in which they have protected, 18∥ both the Committee and counsel have protected the interest of 19 creditors.

The Court is cognizant that you don't see often what goes on outside of court, that the public, unfortunately, is limited to what they see inside the court and there is usually a tremendous amount of activity. This case is no different. Indeed, I think I've referred to this case as being a stealth case in that so much of the work that is being done to protect

6

7

8

11

15

17

18

24

7

the interest of both the creditors, the debtor and parties-in- $2 \parallel$ interest is being done outside the courtroom, without a show so to speak that usually just adds, impedes into the cost of the So the Court is appreciative of the manner in which the Committee and counsel have worked to protect their interests.

In doing so and now having said that, over the Committee counsel's strenuous objections in chambers, I have decided to limit the manner in which the motion today is going to be presented to the Court in that I'm directing the parties to rely on their papers without adding additional argument. I'm doing so because in this Court's view continued argument over the merits or lack of merits or the truthfulness of statements and positions that appear in the communications that are on file would simply exacerbate the problem.

The Court does not want oral argument in which certain statements that have not been vetted by the Court, that have not been authorized by the Court, that have not been supported by outside evidence to be communicated to the public for reliance outside of the process that is improved by the Code in Section 1125(b). For parties to argue and contest the merits and truthfulness and accuracy of their competing positions simply provides the public with information that has not yet been vetted and approved and only makes this situation even worse.

7

8

11

12

15

17

18

24

The Court is prepared to enter an order and I'm going 2 to read portions of the order into the record that addresses the fact that in the Court's view the debtors' statements 4 outside of their filing invade the process and the Court wants 5 certain steps taken to ensure, at the Committee's assistance and the Court agrees, that all creditors understand that what's reflected in the disclosure statement, in the plan that's on file has not been authorized by the Court, has not been vetted by the Court, has not been approved by the Court and that solicitations based on what's been filed are improper.

The Committee has filed a statement in which they outline the issues they have generally with the plan by category and by substance and since that information is on file along with the information that's included in the debtors' disclosure statement and the debtors' position, further argument should await proper process which is a contested disclosure statement hearing where both the debtor and the Committee can supplement their arguments and this Court will decide what information should go out to the public, to the parties-in-interest and to the creditors. Before that process is completed the Court urges all parties-in-interest to avoid reliance on any of the statements that they are reading because they reflect only the position of competing parties and advocacy.

7

8

11

12

13

16

17

18

20

The Court is prepared to enter today on the emergent $2 \parallel$ motion the following order enforcing Section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code. The sum and substance of the Court's order $4 \parallel$ will read as follows. Apart from the pleadings consistent with 5 the Bankruptcy Code and Rules or as permitted by today's 6 ruling, neither the debtor nor the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors shall publish any advocacy communication to a website, Twitter feed, on the docket or otherwise concerning the debtors' plan and disclosure statement until such time as the disclosure statement and solicitation materials have been approved.

Within 24 hours of the entry of this order the debtors shall post a corrective letter on the case docket, their website and their Twitter feed, will also e-mail to all creditors that receive communications described in the emergency motion. The corrective letter shall state as follows. To all concerned, blocked by prematurely-posted certain statements to the court docket, its website and its Twitter feed on May 13th, 2023 regarding a proposed plan of reorganization we urge each of you to disregard those communications until such a time as the publication and dissemination of such statements are authorized, blocked by its publication of those communications is inconsistent with the requirements of the Bankruptcy Code and undertaking without Court authorization. The Court has directed Blockfi to

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

17

18

20

21

circulate this communication on behalf of the Committee to clarify that the Court has not yet approved Blockfi's disclosure statement or Blockfi's ability to solicit 4 acceptances of its plan.

At this juncture the Committee, among other parties, does not support the plan of reorganization in question, among other issues. The Committee believes that the plan provides releases of litigation claims against, among others, current and former directors and officers of Blockfi that committed significant misconduct, that harmed Blockfi and its customers. These are the positions taken by the Committee as of this date.

The Committee also believed that it is not appropriate for Blockfi via its current management and professionals to control the liquidation of Blockfi and distributions to creditors. The Committee has requested changes to the plan. The Committee has not, however, proposed its own plan and, in fact, is barred from doing so by the debtors' exclusivity entitlements under the Bankruptcy Code nor has the Committee taken any formal position on certain issues ascribed to the Committee in the prior communications.

A disclosure statement must be approved by the Court before any party may lawfully encourage you to accept or reject any plan of reorganization. Accordingly, Blockfi withdraws any prior statements concerning your vote on the plan, the Committee's positions regarding the plan and any alternatives

that might be proposed by the Committee. At the appropriate time after the Court has authorized the dissemination of one or more disclosure statements, the parties may communicate to all creditors their respective positions as part of the solicitation process.

That's this Court's ruling today. I am authorizing the Committee in conjunction with the efforts of the debtor to communicate the Court's ruling, to provide its statement which is already on the docket to those parties that have received the communications by Blockfi and to reiterate, of course, today's Court's ruling.

Now, the Court recognizes that both the Committee's statement as well as the debtors' disclosure statement and responses will be supplemented consistent with the Bankruptcy Rules and the Code and that all parties are reserving their rights going forward with respect to the plan process. At the same time the Court is of the firm belief that parties are not served by a hotly-contested, expensive and time-consuming litigation over this plan process. If that happens, the Court will address the contested issues in an efficient and expeditious fashion.

But in order to avoid those costs and delays and risks, the Court is directing the parties to engage in an expedited mediation process with respect to the debtors' proposed plan. The Court will identify a mediator after taking

recommendations from both the Committee and the debtor. $2 \parallel$ parties can agree on a proposed mediator, of course, the Court 3 will pursue the efforts of that mediator. The Court will also 4 ask debtors' counsel to prepare a proposed form of mediation 5 order once the mediator has been identified and a protocol and, of course, communications made and documents and information provided during the course of the mediation will remain confidential and not be available absent consent.

7

8

9

11

17

18

19

21

22

There are also pending motions to seal much of what 10 the Court has referenced as far as information that was included in the declaration of Tristan Axelrod as well as information that was included in the statement that's on file. The only objection that the Court is aware of -- well, I shouldn't say that. Needless to say, the Committee has expressed an interest in having full disclosure but recognizes the mandate to at least pursue sealing efforts, but I understand that the U.S. Trustee has objected to sealing or redactions under Section 107.

Mr. Sponder, does the U.S. Trustee want to place anything on the record?

MR. SPONDER: Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon again. Jeff Sponder from the Office of the United States Trustee. Your Honor, the debtor and/or the Committee, since the Committee is the one that filed the motions under seal, they have the burden of showing that the information to be

4

7

8

11

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

24

sealed falls within the parameters of an exception to Section $2 \parallel 107$ (a) by demonstrating that the interest in secrecy outweighs the presumption in favor of access.

It appears that the sealing motions rely on a $5\parallel$ protective order and/or some type of confidentiality agreement. Your Honor, a protective order is not sufficient grounds to support the sealing of information nor is an agreement among parties to keep information confidential not sufficient grounds. Neither the debtor nor the Committee have made any showing that the information to be sealed is protected under Section 107. As a result, the United States Trustee believes, Your Honor, that these motions should be denied and the information should be disseminated to the public. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sponder.

The Court is overruling the objections of the U.S. Trustee and doing so notes the inherent tension between 1125 of the Code and 107. With Section 1125, restricting the information that can go out to the public as part of the plan and disclosure statement process until Court approval to avoid improper solicitation activity and to ensure that the information that the public receives as part of this process has been vetted, has been reviewed by all parties-in-interest and has been approved only after the Court has had the ability and the opportunity to hold a hearing in which the parties can

5

8

10

11

12

13

17

18

21

23

1 raise issues with the language and content, that flies in the 2 face of Section 107 which mandates disclosure of information that is on file.

In order to ensure the proper administration of this case and to better serve the interest of the creditors in getting accurate information that has been approved, vetted and authorized, the Court is going to employ its authority under Section 105 to overrule the objection, noting the tension between the statutory sections.

Let me ask at this point do any counsel wish to raise any issues or concerns that the Court may have missed?

MR. STARK: Just some clarifications, Your Honor, if I may. Again, Robert Stark, Brown Rudnick, on behalf of the Creditors Committee. First, just so that we have a clear record, we have asked, and I do not believe there's an objection from my opposition, that the documents that were attached to the Axelrod declarations would be formally admitted into evidence so that they are as part of the record in evidentiary fashion, all of them. That was my understanding that there would be no objection albeit they are under seal.

MR. SUSSBERG: No objection, Your Honor, as long as 22 they're under seal.

THE COURT: They are under seal and the Court accepts 24 those documents into the record.

7

8

11

17

18

19

20

21

25

MR. STARK: Thank you, Your Honor. Second 2 | clarification, Your Honor, when we were chatting earlier, Your Honor's ruling earlier about clarification that creditors would 4 receive and I think Your Honor was clear with respect to what 5 the debtor has to do but I want to make sure that we have clarity on the record about the Committee's authorization in terms of making its views known.

My understanding had been, and I think Your Honor alluded to it but I want to make sure we have a clear record and I have clear instructions, is that the Committee is authorized to send e-mails to the same people that received the 12 company's e-mails and we can hyperlink or otherwise attach our statement with respect to the plan and today's ruling from Your Honor, whether it be in whole or in part from the record and that would be the same communication format that individual creditors received, whether it be e-mail or what have you and that the company is required to assist us in terms of being able to get that out the door.

THE COURT: That is my understanding.

Is there any objection?

MR. SUSSBERG: No, Your Honor. We will coordinate.

We will send the order and the statement. 22

23 MR. STARK: No, no, no, Your Honor. It's our 24 statement.

MR. SUSSBERG: The Committee's statement.

```
THE COURT: It will be the Committee's communication.
 1
2 I thought that the debtor has to actually undertake that as
 3
   part of the same platform.
                        Or share with us how it can be done.
 4
             MR. STARK:
 5
             THE COURT: Correct.
 6
             MR. STARK: And it will be ours.
 7
             THE COURT: It's your communication. It won't be
   Blockfi's communication.
 8
 9
             MR. STARK: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
             THE COURT: All right, thank you.
11
             Any other issues?
12
             MR. SUSSBERG: Nothing further from us, Your Honor.
13
   Joshua Sussberg from Kirkland Ellis on behalf of the debtors.
   We appreciate your time today and look forward to mediation.
15
             THE COURT: All right. Let's see, it's Thursday. If
   possible, by close of business tomorrow can I get
   recommendations on mediators?
17
             MR. STARK: Yes, Your Honor.
18
19
             MR. SUSSBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
20
             THE COURT:
                         Thank you. Please meet and confer.
21
             Again, I want to thank all the professionals
22∥involved. I know this is an emotional, that there are issues
   here that are troubling, that they are difficult and I
   appreciate the courtesies and professionalism engaged and by
   all counsel. Thank you.
```

1	MR. STARK: Thank you, Judge.
2	MR. SUSSBERG: Thank you.
3	THE COURT: We are adjourned.
4	* * * *
5	CERTIFICATION
6	I, MARY POLITO, court approved transcriber, certify
7	that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official
8	electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-
9	entitled matter and to the best of my ability.
10	
11	
12	<u>/s/ Mary Polito</u>
13	MARY POLITO
14	J&J COURT TRANSCRIBERS, INC. DATE: May 19, 2023
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	